

Thompson (CA)	Veasey	Watson Coleman
Thompson (MS)	Vela	Welch
Titus	Velázquez	Wilson (FL)
Tonko	Visclosky	Yarmuth
Torres	Wasserman	
Tsongas	Schultz	
Vargas	Waters, Maxine	

NOT VOTING—12

Bergman	Ellison	Peterson
Black	Fudge	Richmond
Brady (PA)	Hanabusa	Speier
Cárdenas	Jones	Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1103

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am thankful that he is back with us, but at times I wish he weren't as healthy as he is. I am just joking.

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes are expected no later than 3 p.m.

On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider several bills aimed at giving Americans more affordable healthcare choices:

First, the Protect Medical Innovation Act, sponsored by Representative ERIK PAULSEN. This bill would perma-

nently repeal ObamaCare's burdensome medical device tax. Doing so will create jobs, promote research, and allow for innovation that could lead to the next generation of lifesaving medical technologies;

Next, the Increasing Access to Lower Premium Plans and Expanding Health Savings Accounts Act, sponsored by Representative PETER ROSKAM. This package would expand access to lower cost healthcare options, encourage healthcare savings, and put a 2-year delay on ObamaCare's health insurance tax, which drives up costs of insurance for almost every American;

Finally, the Restoring Access to Medication and Modernizing Health Savings Accounts Act, sponsored by Representative LYNN JENKINS. This bill would transform and modernize health savings accounts and allow for more innovation in healthcare delivery.

I look forward to the House passing all three of these critical bills without delay.

Mr. Speaker, we also hope to vote on the conference report to accompany H.R. 5515, the National Defense Authorization Act. This House is committed to rebuilding our military and ensuring our brave men and women in uniform have the equipment and training they need to successfully carry out their mission.

I want to thank the Armed Services Committee for their hard work on this bill, especially their chairman, MAC THORNBERRY, and I look forward to another big bipartisan vote.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, additional legislative items are possible in the House. As soon as our schedule is finalized, I will be sure to inform all Members.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his exposition of the schedule.

I want to speak briefly to the appropriations process.

I think the Appropriations Committee is fairly close to the completion of its bills. Can the gentleman tell us when the balance of the appropriations bills might be coming to the floor and when we can perhaps expect the next appropriations bill on the floor?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee has now passed all 12 bills out of subcommittee. By next week, all 12 bills will have also cleared the full committee. By passing the Interior and Financial Services bills today, the gentleman knows the full House has adopted for the full-year appropriations half of those, six bills, making up over two-thirds of the discretionary budget authority.

House and Senate conferees on the first package are working to produce a conference report, and I look forward to continuing work on FY19 appropriations in the weeks to come. As soon as the items are scheduled for the floor, I will be sure to inform all Members.

As the gentleman knows, this is a different year, as just last year we were

able to pass all 12. But what is different about this year is, over in the Senate, there is action being taken, which is positive for us. That is why we are already into conference.

I look forward to having those conference reports coming back and moving those bills to the President's desk to be signed. I am proud of the fact that two-thirds of all the discretionary spending will have already passed this floor as of this day.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observation. I share his delight that the Senate is moving bills. I would observe that they appear to be moving them in a bipartisan fashion, which I think is positive for an outcome on the appropriations process.

In that vein, I know we are in conference on the MILCON and Legislative Branch minibus. Does the gentleman have any idea when that might conclude and we might be considering that conference?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not know at this time. I know they are continuing to work. As soon as they get their work done, I will advise the Members. I will bring it to the floor then.

□ 1115

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me just mention, we just had a vote, and, obviously, I was disappointed in the outcome. I was the sponsor, probably as the gentleman knows, of the Help America Vote Act, which created the Election Assistance Commission. The Election Assistance Commission bill, the HAVA bill, passed with a big bipartisan vote and was signed, as the gentleman knows, by President George W. Bush in a very bipartisan effort.

The premise was that, for 200 years, the Federal Government had not participated in assisting the States in running Federal elections. I will repeat that. The vote for President, the vote for Senate, and the vote for the House were all done through State administrations with no participation by the Federal Government.

In 2002, the Congress and the President made a determination that we would contribute to making sure that our elections ran correctly. The gentleman will remember the issue of hanging chads and the question of whether or not votes were properly counted. It was of great concern across the aisle. So we passed the legislation.

Unfortunately, however, we have not continued to pursue that. And today's vote, we have a greater challenge today. The challenge in the 2000 election was inappropriate administration, domestically, of our election. The problem in 2016, as Speaker RYAN pointed out and the Intelligence Committee found and the intelligence community has found, was that there was clearly an outside attack on America by Russia, and perhaps others, to undermine the integrity of our elections.

The vote that we held just a few minutes ago was about the Federal Government continuing to partner with the States to ensure the integrity of our election system and its safety from outside attack, interference, and undermining.

I hope, Mr. Leader, that we could visit that issue. I hope the Senate visits that issue. Perhaps we can visit it in conference, and, together, Republicans and Democrats could join together in an effort to work with our partners in the States to ensure the integrity of the administration of our election and to ensure that votes are cast correctly, counted correctly, and reported correctly.

As the sponsor of that bill that was cosponsored, as the gentleman may remember—no, you weren't here in '02—by Bob Ney of Ohio, but overwhelmingly supported on both sides of the aisle, I hope that we could move ahead, in the weeks ahead, as we move toward the November 6 election, to make sure that Americans—Democrats, Republicans, independents, all others, and not only in this country but around the world—have confidence in the results of our election.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the gentleman wants to respond to that. I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, there is one part of what the gentleman said with which I disagree. The vote we just had was a motion to recommit. We all know what motions to recommit are.

The good news about this is, last year in the omni, we fully funded the Help America Vote Act. That vote was a different vote. That was a vote that moved on to the President and was signed into law.

Now, of that funding that we fully funded—because we believe, just as the gentleman does, that we want to make sure our elections are fair, honest, and that people do not try to manipulate them—40 percent of that money that we fully funded is still available. The challenge here is that we have 19 States that have yet to apply.

So we should work together to make sure those States are applying, because the money is sitting there, and the money has been fully funded. We want to make sure, in the Help America Vote Act, that it continues, that States apply for that money, and that the elections are safe and sound and honest.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observation.

I would simply be constrained to say, I listened to Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I listened to his opposition to the MTR. The pretense that the amendment that was offered is somehow a procedural or nonconsequential amendment is incorrect. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN didn't even try to make the argument. He said it was a good bill; we ought to pass it. Fine. The amendment would have not undermined the bill in any way.

Now, there is a provision in that bill, as the gentleman knows, to, in effect,

undermine the agreement that was made last year, with respect to the funding levels, by putting \$500 million into a grandchild's or a children's fund by the chairman of the subcommittee. It is a little bit like your rescissions.

The gentleman who put that in voted for a \$2 trillion deficit-creating document and put \$500 million in a trust fund to bring down that deficit. I know my friend is happy that that will, at that rate, take 4,000 years to fill that \$2 trillion hole.

So I disagree with my friend that the amendment would have had any adverse effect on the bill that was passed.

Now, I voted against the bill, but the bill passed the House of Representatives. Nothing would have adversely affected that bill. I appreciate what the gentleman said about last year's action, which I supported, which I thought was correct, and which I appreciated the Congress taking.

Next, Mr. Speaker, we had a vote on ICE. The gentleman can argue it one way or the other. I know you criticized us; we criticized you. The fact of the matter is, what it did not deal with—and you will indicate that there was a bill that dealt with this in a fashion. But, again, I would remind you that your pledge, through your Speaker, was to take issues head-on, one at a time, discretely, not confuse them.

I would urge the leader, the Speaker, and the majority party to bring a bill to the floor that deals simply with an issue with which we believe the overwhelming majority of Americans agree: Do not rip children from the arms of their parents. Do not estrange children from their parents for weeks and months. Do not traumatize children, perhaps permanently, by this policy of separating children.

I would hope and urge the majority leader to bring a bill to the floor that would deal with that discrete issue.

Mr. NADLER has a bill, H.R. 6135, to prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from pursuing this policy of separating families. JOHN MCCAIN has said that that policy of separation offends the dignity and decency of the American people. That is JOHN MCCAIN, former candidate for President in your party, Mr. Leader, and I would agree with him on that issue.

I would urge the leader to bring a bill to the floor to deal with this issue directly, and I believe—perhaps I am wrong—that it would receive a very significant majority of support in this House.

I would ask the gentleman, is there any plan to bring such a bill to the floor in the near future?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Correct me if I'm wrong, but you voted against the omni, correct?

Mr. HOYER. The omni last year? Yes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. So you voted against the funding—

Mr. HOYER. I am going to reclaim my time, Mr. Leader, for this.

Mr. MCCARTHY. If I can finish, you had stated at the end of your last

statement that you voted for that funding. I was just correcting. By voting against the omni, you voted against the funding for that.

Mr. HOYER. Of course, I supported that policy. Now, the reason I was going to reclaim my time, very frankly, Mr. Leader, I have done some research on bills you voted against. I could go through them and pick out this, that, and the other that everybody in the world was for, and I could say you voted against it. I have not done that.

The reason I have not done it is because I don't think that would be intellectually honest on my part, because I know that there are things I would pick out that you clearly supported but you didn't support some parts of the bill and, therefore, indicated your objection by voting against them, which is exactly what I did in the omni. The gentleman, my friend, knows that to be the case.

My friend brings up CHIP all the time. My friend knows that I have supported CHIP at its very inception and in every step of the way of its development and reauthorization. My friend knows that, but he continues to pretend, because I voted against the omni, that I voted against CHIP. I didn't like the omni. I thought the omni was wrong. Very frankly, I think I was correct in that vote.

Now, the omni passed, and it passed with a very substantial number of Democratic votes. I didn't lobby against the omni with my Members. I did indicate that I did not agree with things you had left out and did not put in the omni, and I, frankly, did not agree with some things that were in the omni.

Having said that, let's not go back and forth. I can get a lot of bills the same way and show that you voted against motherhood and apple pie in this bill, that bill, and the other bill. You know that to be the case. I would hope we can stop doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The only reason I brought it up is your statement at the end was that you voted for it.

Mr. HOYER. You are correct.

Mr. MCCARTHY. At any time, if I may finish, if I state that I voted for something that is incorrect, please bring it up.

Mr. HOYER. I will do that. I will tell you, you are correct in saying that I did not support the omni, but I did support the proposition.

Mr. MCCARTHY. In saying that, you just recently said you supported CHIP, but you voted against it because you voted against the omni. Also, is it not true, when CHIP was by itself on the floor, you voted against CHIP there? Because we brought CHIP to the floor three times.

But if I could move on, that was the case. So you voted against CHIP even when it wasn't in the omni, so there are other reasons to vote against CHIP.

You had a question about a bill.

Mr. HOYER. Separating children from their parents.

Mr. MCCARTHY. As we all know, America is a Nation of immigrants. Almost all of our ancestors came from somewhere else in search of a better life in this land of freedom and opportunity, and we want to maintain that.

Mr. Speaker, America is also a Nation of laws. We support immigration, but it also must be legal immigration. We must have the security, especially, along our southern border. As we speak, our men and women at the border are doing their absolute best to maintain both order and decency.

Since 2014, Border Patrol has completed more than 13,000—let me say that again, 13,000—life-saving rescues along the border, including many children. We would be naive to think that there are not certain individuals hoping to enter this country illegally and to do us harm.

Yesterday, when we talked about ICE, one of the elements that came up was the thousands of gang members that they stop. We all know the most vicious gang out there is MS-13. We know it because we know it in our communities. We see the murders. We see the drugs. We know the hundreds of MS-13 members that they have stopped from being a part of our communities. That is why we had that vote.

Simply put, the entire immigration enforcement community deserves our support because they work under very difficult circumstances. I think everybody would agree with that, which is why, if I can be very honest with my friend, I was upset to see many Democrats refuse to stand with the men and women of ICE yesterday.

Why? Six individuals who work for ICE gave the ultimate sacrifice of their life. One was murdered by the Los Zetas cartel.

The gentleman asked if I would bring up a bill. I offered to bring up a Democrat bill, but the author of the bill who put it across the desk and asked people to cosponsor said he would vote against it.

What was most shocking to me is the number of people who voted “present.” The gentleman can argue with me all day on things I vote “yes” and things I vote “no” on. The only time he will ever see my vote up there for “present” is a quorum call, because I believe the American public and my constituents expect me to make a decision when I come.

I think it was very clear yesterday. You can make a decision. I know my friend and his beliefs, but I also know his party has a new movement. It is a socialist party, and they are gaining steam. But that new party and that new movement in there, I still believe, would want you to make a decision one place or the other.

Just last year alone, ICE made almost 5,000 gang-related arrests. They seized nearly 1 million pounds of narcotics and opioids.

The gentleman knows, those 2 weeks we spent on this floor dealing with the

opioid epidemic, there will be more than 100 Americans who will die today because of opioids, and tomorrow will be the same. That is why we did CARA in the last Congress. That is why we came back with billions of dollars of funding to combat the epidemic. That is why we came back and spent 2 weeks on this floor passing more than 50 bills.

□ 1130

But think for one moment. If my friend on the other side, his colleague, was able to abolish ICE, that would be 1 million more pounds of narcotics. And it is more than just opioids. It is fentanyl. A small dose will kill you.

They rescued more than 900 sexually exploited children. They stopped thousands of predators. My friend knows that, too, when we were able to finally stop human trafficking on the internet.

Backpage.com is no longer there because this Congress acted, and they are being prosecuted. Seventy percent of all human trafficking happens online. But do you know what? We can celebrate that that has changed because of this Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we want America to remain a land of opportunity, but demeaning the individuals who keep this country safe and calling to abolish ICE is certainly not the way to do it.

I thank my friend, and I think we have a difference of opinion, and I think a strong difference of opinion, and that is healthy. But sometimes when you have a difference of opinion, it is a “no” and a “yes,” not just a “present.” You might come to the debate, but you ought to participate and you ought to take a stance.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talks a lot about law enforcement, correctly so. We ought to honor those who protect us and who put their life and limb at risk daily to do so. We ought to honor them whether they are ICE agents, whether they are Border Patrol agents, whether they are DIA agents, whether they are members of the Armed Forces, whether they are members of the sheriff's departments or police departments in our various communities around the country. We ought to have compassion for those who are victims whom they are protecting and compassion for those whom we lose in the performance of their law enforcement duties.

There is not a Member of Congress who has been at more memorial services for law enforcement officers that we have lost through the centuries than I have, period.

Yesterday's vote was because of the patently political nature of the resolution that was offered. The majority leader says he wanted to offer a bill of one of our Members who suggested the elimination of ICE—small number. And that Member, apparently, according to the majority leader, told him: Look, I am going to vote “no” on that if you bring it to the floor, obviously trying to raise a point about wanting to stop the policies and practices—not the ICE

agency, but the policies and practices of ripping, literally ripping children from the arms of their fathers and mothers and estranging them at places that neither knew where the other was.

The gentleman talks about the opioid epidemic being on the front page. It is there, and properly so, because it is a crisis, and we have dealt with it in a bipartisan way, which was correct to do so. We believed it was underfunded for some period of time. We have come up with some more funds. We are glad about that.

But he did not answer my question, and he distracted us from the focus. There was a bill, which we didn't like, because the bill had a lot of other stuff in it, which is why the Speaker said we ought to consider things discreetly, individually, one at a time. Don't confuse and obfuscate the issue.

So bring a bill to the floor that says that the policy that the President was pursuing, that he then changed—and the courts have now interjected themselves; we don't know for how long—to say that we ought not, that is not who we are as Americans, Mr. Speaker.

These 2- and 3- and 4-year-old children whom we see on the front pages of our paper, they are not MS-13. There is not a Member on this floor who will defend MS-13. There is not a Member on this floor who does not want to see the folks who gain some status by being an MS-13 caught, stopped, and taken out of our country if they are not citizens of this country, not a one of us. So that is a red herring dragged across this floor back and forth yesterday and today.

Mr. Speaker, you would think that we could say that America's values do not support taking children, small children, infant children. An instance was cited on the floor yesterday where a mother was nursing her child and that child was taken from her and the mother was put in handcuffs.

Is that America? Is that the compassionate country of which George Bush talked? Is it that bright and shining city on the hill of which Ronald Reagan spoke? I think not, Mr. Speaker.

Lastly, I know that flood insurance is going to expire July 31. I see the ranking member, Ms. MAXINE WATERS, on the floor. I know she has been working on this with Mr. HENSARLING. Does the leader know whether or not that bill might be coming to the floor or some extension coming to the floor next week?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

To answer his last question first, yes, we will extend flood insurance through November 30 as we continue to work through the other differences we have. We do not want flood insurance to lapse, and we will have that on the floor.

But the gentleman brought up a couple of other points. If I may, I come from a family of immigrants. I come

from a family in which nobody was a Republican. I chose to be in this party based upon its philosophy.

If you come to my office, I have two Presidents' hanging portraits: Abraham Lincoln. The greatest challenge ever to this Nation was the Civil War. Abraham Lincoln was the first Republican President. And the other one is, the other reason why—both of those men—I chose to, and that was Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan did talk about that shining city on the hill. There was another President at the time, and I saw the difference, and I made my selection.

But the gentleman talks about the challenges with the rule of law, the challenges at the border. Nobody on this side wants children to be mistreated. That is why we dealt with the issue, and we brought it to the floor. There was an executive order that dealt with it.

But we moved two pieces of legislation dealing with immigration. Not one Democrat on the other side worked with us. Maybe there were problems. Maybe they disagreed with having greater security on the border, having a wall. I understand that, but maybe that is the difference.

But the question you brought forward was the bill on the floor yesterday. It had nothing negative in it. It had nothing about children. It talked about:

Do you support ICE?

Do you support the families of those six individuals who were murdered in the line of duty?

Do you support the stopping of drugs coming across the border?

Do you stand with those children who get exploited? Those ICE agents actually find them.

Do you stand with ICE when they stop those human traffickers, the modern-day slavery of today, and stop those people?

Well, we had an opportunity for that. I know this other side of the aisle and I know the new Democratic Socialist Party feels differently, probably feels differently than my friend. They want to abolish it. They never put a bill in to reform it. They said, "Abolish it."

If we were proposing a bill that said "support it," I would allow your bill to come up as well so we could have a clear choice. But when you were given that offer, the author of the bill said, "I would vote 'no.'" The people you asked to cosponsor, "We vote 'no,'" makes me wonder.

But the most shocking part to me—I know we take tough votes on this floor. I know there are tough decisions to be made. But at the end of the day, you have to make a decision because that is why the American people sent you here.

I have never been in a debate, in a primary or a general, where they ask me: If a bill came to the floor, will I vote "present"? I have never been asked that by my district. Republican or Democrat or Independent or Green

Party: "I want you to go to Washington. I want you to be on that floor. I want you to make a strong debate down in the well. And when you get the opportunity, you press that 'present' button," never, never have I heard that and never would I have thought I would see that. I have never seen so much color on that board as I saw yesterday.

And if you truly felt your convictions of what you said, your own "present" vote made it pass, then go back to the individuals you talk to, go back to that new Socialist Party and tell them what you did, because I didn't see convictions yesterday. I saw you play politics.

Our issues are too important. People have lost their lives, and you vote "present." Now, we have more work to be done. We take this job seriously.

Ronald Reagan talked about that shining city on the hill, about everybody rising up. This is the exact same debate we had when we wanted to pass tax reform. Not one person on the other side of the aisle could vote with it, but there are 1 million more Americans working today.

When I look at the last 49 years of America—because there are a lot of people in this Chamber who are younger than that—there has only been 7 months where unemployment has been below 4 percent. And do you realize that 2 of those months, you just lived through it in April and May? You have never seen the opportunity that you grasp for today.

And do you know what happens with that opportunity? More people want to come, and that is good for America. But we should come legally.

We know our system is broken, and I know my friend knows it, too, because we spent hours talking and trying to work something out. So, yes, we brought a bill to the floor, and we had a pretty good idea that probably it wouldn't pass. Why? Because nobody on the other side of the aisle wanted to step forward.

You know the process; it would go to the Senate. Maybe it is not just perfect, but I think this country is too important to vote "present," and I am going to take risks and I am going to bring bills to the floor that take risks.

So I thank the gentleman for the question. But what I really ask—the election is still a ways away. Stop playing politics. Be a part. That voting card, I don't even know why we have a "present" button here.

We want quorum, let's just all say it. But the idea of something so important that people have lost their lives over, what do you think those families felt like today? What do you think those families felt like?

Or what do you think about that young child who got saved from being exploited or got put back to the family and saved?

What do you think about the drugs that didn't come through, the number of lives that continue to live today because of that?

Or what do you think about those men and women, a part of ICE, who question does this government even support them. And every day they risk their lives for that.

It is not a day to vote "present." If you disagree, if you are part of the Socialist Party, stand up and take a stance. Let the American public know where you stand.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman knows damn well that is not the case, and I am tired of hearing him demagogue about that. I expect him to do it between now and the election, but the gentleman is not honest when he does it, and he knows that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCCARTHY. May I ask the gentleman what am I not saying correctly? Were there "present" votes in that Chamber?

Mr. HOYER. He says something about the Democratic Socialist Party—it is my time. It is my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNN). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCCARTHY. May I ask the gentleman—the 133 "present" votes, did they not take place yesterday?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is my time.

This is the most autocratic Congress in which I have served. It has had the most closed rules. And the majority leader brings to the floor his version of what he wants to say and how he wants to characterize it. No consultation with us, no amendments allowed, and then we say we are not going to vote against ICE agents. We honor the work that they do. We honor the sacrifices they make. We honor the critical role they play in defending our country and enforcing our laws.

□ 1145

But, Mr. Leader, we are not going to take it or leave it. We are not going to vote "no" on a resolution that purports simply to honor our ICE agents. If it were simply that, it may have been a different matter.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the majority leader would stop talking about—there are some people in his party who say absolutely absurd things at the very highest level of his party, and I haven't brought them up.

Mr. Speaker, I asked a simple question. The Speaker of this House said he was going to bring issues to this floor individually, vote them up or down. I asked the leader: Will you bring a bill to the floor which will stop the separation of children from their parents? He says he did. 113 of his colleagues on his side of the aisle thought it was a bad bill and voted "no."

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, they didn't vote "present."

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, they didn't vote "present." I voted "present" because I wanted to say to the leader, Mr.

Speaker, I am not going to take it or leave it.

He wants to make me look like I am not for law enforcement when I have been for law enforcement in the 50 years I have been in public office, without fail—without fail.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, then why did he vote “present”?

Mr. HOYER. I voted “present,” Mr. Speaker, because I was not going to take it or leave it. I was not going to just take what the majority leader wanted to shove down my throat and the throat of others. Because, Mr. Speaker, the rhetoric in that bill—and let me say to the leader, Mr. Speaker, he and I worked on a lot of resolutions regarding Israel, and we want to keep the Congress united on Israel, and we keep the Congress united on Israel.

How do we do it, Mr. Speaker? We work on the language. We work on the language of the whereas clauses and the resolved clauses so that we can create a broad majority. We could have done that with the ICE bill, easily—easily—an overwhelming support for their role and for their courage and for their character.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I asked about the bill that deals with flood insurance. I think the gentleman has told me that that is going to come to the floor, and I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I know he misspoke earlier on a couple of things, and I think he may have misspoken again. He made a comment. He said we are autocratic. He said we are the most closed. So I just want to go to facts.

This Congress has a 20-year high for bills enacted with bipartisan cosponsors, a 20-year high. Those are not my words. That is from Quorum, a company that only deals with data and measures all. So that means we are the most bipartisan Congress in more than 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman want to know something else, just on facts? He said we close everything. There have been over 1,650 amendments. 745 of those were Democratic amendments. So I looked back to Speaker PELOSI. She allowed less than 1,000 amendments in the entire 111th Congress.

So, I am sorry, those statements were not correct.

Now, we can have differences of opinion. He has a right to vote “present.” If he gets mad about it, he can get mad about it, but that is what the RECORD shows.

And he said because what were the resolved clauses. Mr. Speaker, the gen-

tleman knows that bill was on suspension. The rules of suspension have a higher threshold to pass, but it also means there are no amendments.

If you want to be fair, instead of just the bill that was coming forward, I offered to bring a Democratic bill up that would abolish ICE.

So, for the American people to know, let's see what the resolved clauses say, because this made so many Democrats vote “no” or “present.”

Resolved. That the House of Representatives expresses its continued support for all United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, officers and personnel, who carry out the important mission of ICE;

Denounces calls for the complete abolishment of ICE; and

Supports the efforts of all Federal agencies, State law enforcement, and military personnel who bring law and order to our Nation's borders.

That is what the resolved said. That is what moved the other side to vote “present.” That is what we voted on.

He may be upset. I am upset he voted “present,” too. But I don't know what in this clause drove all the Democrats here, because you know on suspension he helped it pass.

But is it because that announcement denounces calls for the complete abolishment of ICE, because that is the bill he put across the desk? If that is what he is asking for, he can stand with his convictions. Don't put a bill across the desk, cosponsor it, and then when he has something on the floor that is only positive, that is only standing with the people of ICE, say he has to vote “present.” I don't know where the courage is there.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't know who “we” is. Somebody who introduces a bill on either side of the aisle doesn't make it a “we” bill.

And the reason they brought the non-binding resolution to the floor, when they really wanted to bring the bill to the floor, is because it wouldn't have served their political purposes because everybody on our side of the aisle would have voted “no.” He knows it. That is why he didn't bring it to the floor, for politics; not for principle, for politics.

And to his credit, I understand the Speaker didn't want to bring it to the floor either. At least that is what is reported in the papers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my question has still not been answered.

There have been more closed rules in this Congress than any Congress in recent memory, during the time I have served. Now, there have been a lot of bills passed, and we passed them on bipartisanship. We had about six, seven, eight, or nine naming a post office the other day.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, that is a lot less than under his leadership.

Mr. HOYER. Isn't that wonderful.

I voted for all of them, either by voice vote or by card. They were bills that we all agreed with.

But more closed rules on this floor, including today's bill that we passed, than any Congress in recent memory.

My question to the majority leader was: Will he bring to the floor a free-standing bill which provides that children will not be separated from their parents—which JOHN MCCAIN says is inconsistent with the decency of the American people—so that we can vote on that proposition and that proposition only. The majority leader has not answered that question.

He talks about voting “present,” which he didn't like. I am sorry he didn't like it, but I would vote “present” again to express my opposition, the only way it was possible to do, because, unlike his characterization, I did not want to say to ICE agents, “I do not respect you.” Therefore, I did not want to vote against a resolution, the resolved clause of which I agreed with.

But it didn't deal with the most critical issue. It could have—it didn't—and it is nonbinding. To argue about that is to dissemble about the question that I asked.

I am prepared to end this because I don't think we are going anywhere. I don't think I am going to get an answer from the majority leader, and I don't think he will bring it to the floor, free-standing, any more than he will bring a comprehensive immigration reform bill, which is so necessary to this country, to the floor, no more than he will bring a Dreamers protection act to this floor.

He is gesticulating, Mr. Speaker, as if: What do you mean by that?

He brought a bill to the floor that he said solved the problem that 113 of his Members voted against. It got over 300 votes against. That is not a viable option to bring to the floor. He knew it was going to fail. He knew it was another message bill.

So I asked him: Will he bring that bill to the floor individually, discretely, to protect these children, or not? I haven't gotten an answer to that.

The second thing I asked him, which he did answer, is that we are going to bring a bill to the floor, apparently, hopefully, to protect those who live in flood zones and who are going to have trouble getting flood insurance on August 1. He says he will bring that to the floor.

Now, I am prepared to close and to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield because I just think the RECORD needs to be corrected.

The gentleman knows, Mr. Speaker, that we brought two immigration bills to this floor that would solve the problem. The gentleman also knows there was an executive order signed that stopped this action being taken before this even went forward.

But I also heard the gentleman say that he voted “present” because he didn’t want the ICE agents to think he didn’t support them, and that he supported those things in the resolved. Prior, he said that is why he voted against it.

I read what was in the resolved. I don’t understand how anybody in America looks at voting “present” with an idea you support it. That is the only thing that I question.

Now, the gentleman also knows that this is the most productive Congress in modern history. It has passed more bills out of committee than any Congress in the last 25 years. It has passed more bills in this Chamber than any one in the last 25 years. He sees the openness to the number of amendments; and it is not just the number of amendments to Republicans because there are hundreds upon hundreds for Democrats.

The gentleman also knows that the immigration bills that came to this floor had an opportunity. But what is interesting to me is that people want just one that they can support.

Earlier, I heard he voted against CHIP because it was in the omni, but CHIP was on the floor by itself and he voted against it then.

He can vote for the post office bills and that didn’t deal with the immigration either, but he can vote for that. But then when it came to supporting ICE, the majority of Democrats voted “present.” That is not a profile in courage. That is walking away from a situation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this has gone on longer than it should have. But it has given us time to look at a MILCON-VA vote on May 15, 2008, in which the majority leader, on a substantive vote, not a resolution that was nonbinding, but a substantive appropriations bill, voted “present.”

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I can’t believe that to be true.

Mr. HOYER. Voted “present,” Mr. Speaker, voted “present.”

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JULY 19, 2018, TO MONDAY, JULY 23, 2018

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, July 23, 2018, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that

the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 526. An act to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes.

S. 791. An act to amend the Small Business Act to expand intellectual property education and training for small businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 2850. An act to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund.

DOCKUM DRUGSTORE SIT-IN ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. ESTES of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 60th anniversary of the beginning of the Dockum Drugstore sit-in.

In 1958, 20-year-old Ron Walters and his cousin, Carol Parks-Hahn, were inspired by a California campus restaurant sit-in, the Little Rock Nine, and the Montgomery bus boycott. Bravely seeking to challenge the status quo of segregation in Wichita, they planned a sit-in at a downtown drugstore with a lunch counter for White customers only.

On July 19, 10 students walked into the Dockum Drugstore and sat down. They were described as well dressed and polite, and sought only to be served a soft drink at the counter.

For 3 weeks, the students entered the drugstore every day, boldly sitting through cursing, questioning, and even threats. Finally, on August 11, the store manager declared: “Serve them. I’m losing too much money.”

Following their success, similar efforts became a hallmark of the civil rights movement. And today, on this 60th anniversary, their actions continue to inspire.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful these young men and women took action to end segregation in their community.

□ 1200

SOVEREIGNTY OF TRIBES IN OUR NATION

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, the United States Constitution defines Tribes in our Nation as sovereign governments with a unique relationship with the United States Federal Government. Many treaties and Supreme Court cases show legal precedent that they are sovereign nations, and the United States has a trust responsibility to ensure they have Social Services like healthcare in exchange for taking their land.

The Trump administration is not recognizing the legal right Tribes have.

They are solely considering Tribes as a racial group as their justification to impose Medicaid work requirements that we know will disproportionately result in less healthcare for Native Americans. This is wrong, illegal, and a dangerous precedent.

What happened to the treaties our government signed? What happened to the Federal trust responsibility? And what other social and legal responsibility will they negate next?

I will not stand by and watch the sovereignty of our Nation’s first people attacked, and neither should you, Mr. Speaker.

AMERICA IS FINALLY BETTER OFF

(Mr. RUTHERFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because, after years of struggling to get ahead, America is finally better off. America is stronger at home and abroad, with a booming economy, safer communities, and a revived military.

Thanks to the historic tax reform, unemployment is at an all-time low; job openings are at record highs; paychecks are increasing; wages are rising; and small businesses are expanding. I hear it from people in Florida all the time: My constituents are better off.

Mr. Speaker, I represent Florida’s Fourth Congressional District, which is home to many military families; and I am proud to say that we have begun to rebuild our military and support our men and women in uniform. We have passed legislation giving our troops the largest pay increase in almost 9 years, and investing \$144 billion in upgrading and maintaining our military facilities. Our military men and women are better off.

The work that we have done and continue to do is creating a better way for the people of northeast Florida and for all Americans. Although there is much more to do, the economy is soaring, and Republican policies are helping to improve people’s lives, making it easier for families to get ahead with a renewed sense of confidence.

CHILD ABUSE AT OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

(Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the child abuse at the southern border.

Three months have passed since the Trump administration announced the zero-tolerance policy that led directly to the humanitarian crisis we now witness today. Three months later and, still, thousands of children remain separated from their families.

This week, Federal judges announced a complete, one-week pause on all family deportations, as well as mandatory